





ADDITIONAL REMARKS

ON THE

TOPOGRAPHY OF TROY, &c.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS

ON THE

TOPOGRAPHY OF TROY, &c.

AS GIVEN

BY HOMER, STRABO, AND THE ANCIENT GEOGRAPHERS ;

IN ANSWER TO

MR. BRYANT'S LAST PUBLICATIONS.

BY

J. B. S. MORRITT, Esq.

SI MENS NON LEVA FUISSET,
TROJAQUE NUNC STARES, TRIANIQUE AD ALTA MANERES.

VIRGIL, L. 2.

L O N D O N :

PRINTED FOR T. CADELL, JUN. AND W. DAVIES, STRAND.

M. DCCC.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS

ON THE

TOPOGRAPHY OF THE TROAD, &c.

IN the course of last spring, Mr. Bryant published in answer to a Book of mine* some Observations; in which I was informed for the first time, that I had mistaken Vindication for Abuse, and with the most disingenuous malice, had blackened and detracted from a character universally and deservedly esteemed by all men of literature. If I was in fact guilty of this charge, I merited, for I *provoked*, the answer Mr. Bryant has honoured me with; but as it did not appear to me to contribute at all to the support of his hypothesis, I disregarded the personal censures which he was pleased to inflict upon me. Unfortunately for himself the learned Conductor of the British Critic differed from Mr. Bryant; not only on the subject of the Trojan War, but also on the opinion he formed of my publication; in which he did not perceive that *virulence of invective*, that *mean spirit of disingenuous cavil* attributed to it, by that Gentleman. This has drawn upon him† a reply, which, as it might be expected, is longer and stronger in proportion to the offence, and to the literary character of the learned Conductor; who differed from Mr. Bryant on two points, whereas I had the less misfortune of only differing upon one. My petulance, and

NOTES.

* Some Observations on a Vindication of Homer.—† Expostulation to the British Critic.

virulence are of course alluded to a second time ; but as I believe few who read my book, and I trust still fewer who know my character, seriously entertain this opinion of me, I should have continued to acquiesce in silence, if I had not thought that some of the topographical arguments adduced by Mr. Bryant in his last publication, were founded on a mistaken notion of the country ; to which I might have contributed, by the confusion and obscurity he sometimes complains of in my narrative. I wrote at first, as I professed, solely with the intention of adding to Mr. Chevalier, the testimony he deserves from every traveller in the Troad ; but in order to make that testimony of any avail, it was necessary to answer the arguments brought forward by Mr. Bryant ; since if they were unanswerable, Troy, which never existed at all, could not exist where he places it. “ In the answer I have made, there is,” I am told, “ too much Asperity, and unmerited censure ;” of this I am not a fair judge, the reader must decide between us ; but I may be allowed to add, that if there is, it was unintentional, and certainly did not flow from the malignity to which Mr. Bryant ascribes it. But I have accused him (he says*) both with want of probity and want of erudition. One charge I certainly made, and that because I thought it grounded : from the great stress he lays upon some writers of later ages, whilst he almost sets aside the authority of Thucydides and Herodotus ; and from the very strong deductions, which he makes from what I thought weak grounds, I conceived, that he was warped by a love of system ; and I believe I was not singular in that opinion. I never supposed Mr. Bryant guilty of “ wilful perversion of the truth” from any motive ; but I knew that a preconceived system often makes men see every argument through a distorted medium, and induces

NOTE.

* Expostulation, p. 3.

them

them to imagine a thousand proofs and allusions in passages, which either do not apply to the subject, or make directly against their suppositions. This then was not accusing him of *want of probity*; but only of *prejudice*; and I supported the accusation by referring to several passages, which I thought these causes had induced him to misrepresent. I added that, "the reader must judge whether his statements were perfectly fair," and intimated that "some of the quotations were unwarranted; some of the translations materially differing from the originals; and some of the passages erroneously transcribed from the originals themselves;" all which I attributed to the same motive, namely, *love of System*; a source, from which similar evils have very frequently flowed. It is said also, that * I accuse Mr. Bryant of "*absurdity, futility, and ignorance*?" from this charge I appeal to my own book; I never do. In one place† I notice an "*absurdity arising from Mr. Bryant's supposition*," and I shew that it follows from adopting such supposition implicitly: but this mode of arguing *ex absurdo* is extremely common, and I never heard before, that it implied any *personal* absurdity in the adversary; otherwise Euclid is very abusive. Of Mr. Bryant's *futility*, I say no more than of his *absurdity*; I accuse some of his arguments as *futile*, that is *as not being to the purpose*; surely this *futility* does not attach upon Mr. Bryant, but only upon the particular arguments alluded to. But,‡ Mr. Bryant says, that "I have given my opinion of his Erudition, by saying Mr. Bryant's knowledge of the subject with which he is engaged is merely on a par with that of the most ignorant," for which he refers to his answer to the Vindication, p. 72. But see the Vindication itself where these words occur. (p. 31.) "What Mr.

NOTES.

* Expostulation, p. 3.—† Vindication, p. 41.—‡ Expostulation, p. 3.

Bryant says of his [Homer's] Life, farther than conjecture is of no weight; notwithstanding his *well known erudition*, his *authority* (not *his knowledge*) on *this subject* (viz. Homer's Life and Country) is on a level with that of the most ignorant. If this passage is *not perverted* by Mr. Bryant's representation of it, I have passed a very wanton and odious censure on his ignorance; but if it is *perverted*, as I trust is evident from this parallel, of what is he guilty? of an additional *misrepresentation* of a cited passage, to which I leave the reader to assign a motive. My assertion is true, that no man, whatever be his erudition, has been at any time able to ascertain the country and parentage of Homer. Reading, however extensive, is of no avail, where there are no documents extant but such as are doubtful and contradictory. Now in the *Expostulation* (p. 67.) Mr. Bryant himself accuses the British Critic of ascribing to him too determined an opinion concerning Homer and his history. For says he, "The British Critic is very wrong to describe Mr. Bryant as *so determined* in his opinion concerning Homer and his history. Mr. Bryant proposes it with some degree of uncertainty and lays it with proper caution before the reader. In page 53 (of his first work) his words are if I might hazard a *conjecture* about Homer in Egypt. In another place, p. 60. he says, *I am induced to believe—From the evidence given, we may I think conclude, &c. &c.*" A little above* he says that he cannot have entertained a decided opinion about Homer, since he mentioned three, and does not know on which to determine. In what then does he contradict my assertion? All he says of Homer is conjecture; and his opinion so undetermined for want of data that ignorance is equally satisfactory. Had I said Mr. Bryant was ignorant of "the subject with which he

NOTE.

* *Expostulation*, p. 67.

was engaged," viz. the writings of Homer and the war of Troy, I should have been very *deservedly* censured for *petulance and gross ill manners*. But I only doubt his authority where he doubts it himself; and I afterwards pay due deference to the *ingenuity* of some of his conjectures about Homer; * but contend (as I always must) that no inference can reasonably be drawn from the stories concerning him, which at all affects the nature of the question to be discussed; viz. the existence of Troy, and the historical truth of the war. If I have treated Mr. Bryant's arguments with unbecoming levity, it certainly proceeded not from any contempt of his person, or his talents; but levity is sometimes the fault of youth, and I submit to the animadversions he has thought proper to bestow upon my time of life.

I own that with regard to the general question of the probability or improbability of Homer's Story, I cannot perceive in either of Mr. Bryant's late publications that he has brought any *new* arguments forward, which materially affect it in either way. He has rather try'd to set aside some of the answers I had made to his original work, in which I do not think he has entirely succeeded. In the course of this I shall notice some instances. He thinks at all events, that the geography of the plain of Ilium, as given by Mr. Chevalier, Dallaway, and myself, is still entirely incompatible with the Iliad; and renews objections, which appear to me to arise from a misconception of the real geography of the Coast. The points he chiefly insists on are, the course we have assigned to the Scamander, and the situations of Gargarus, and Troy itself. As Mr. Bryant has again repeated these objections in his *Expostulation*, addressed to the *British Critic*, if there is any obscurity in the description I have

NOTE.

* Vindication, p. 76.

published, it is in some measure incumbent upon me to clear it up, that the points on which we are at issue may be fairly stated.

The Scamander, as laid down in * Mr. Chevalier's Map, and in those of Mr. Dallaway and myself, rises in the plain immediately below Troy, and skirting the west side of the plain for some miles, turns suddenly, and pours its waters through a strait artificial canal into the Ægean on the south side of the Sigæan promontory. An ancient course is still traceable from the commencement of this artificial canal, which appears to have been the original natural bed of the river. This being traced out, terminates in a larger stream which descends from the mountains; runs on the eastern side of the plain; and, after the conflux, pours itself into the Hellespont on the eastern side of the Sigæan promontory. To this second river so characterised we have assigned the name of Simois. Below the confluence and at the mouth of the river, the united streams were called *Scamander*. It was further stated, that the stream we called *Scamander* was a clear copious brook, and that its waters were nearly the same in every season of the year as far as the confluence; that the other stream, on the contrary, was a very violent mountain river, fed by the melting of the snows, and the rains that fell on Ida, and therefore was frequently very small, and even dry in Summer, very turbulent, and considerably large in Winter. Below the confluence, the united stream (*Scamander*) was of course proportionally variable. And this description is asserted to be consonant to the intimations of Homer.

NOTE.

* See Chevalier on the plain of Troy, Dallaway on Constantinople. *Vindication*, p. 78-9, also p. 86 and *seq.*

Mr. Bryant makes several objections to this whole system. For he says, first * that the Scamander of Homer was a larger river than the Simois, “ because the waters of both took the name of Scamander below the junction, and never of Simois, that river together with its name was absorbed in the Scamander; the smaller in the greater, of which there are as many instances as there are rivers.” Not quite so many, since not to travel very far, the Ouse, a very inconsiderable stream, gives its name to the united waters of the Swale and Ure, each of which is above a hundred times its bulk. The Scamander is in Summer generally larger than the Simois, (which in great droughts entirely disappears) and therefore more likely to retain its name; and this circumstance had been mentioned both by Chevalier and myself, as a probable cause of this singularity. And a little below † Mr. Bryant says, Mr. M. was mistaken in some degree, because “ The Scamander did not first receive its name after the junction but far above.” It certainly did receive the name far above; so far above, as at the two sources near the Scæan gate; where Homer mentions the “ *δοιχι πηγαὶ Σκαμανδρου δινηεντος*.” Nor does Mr. M. any where intimate a word to the contrary; he apprehends there is a mistake, as he cannot find the passage Mr. Bryant can here allude to.

In the next place, ‡ Mr. Bryant asserts, that the Scamander was the principal river, because of the epithets applied to it by Homer. I have shewn that some of these epithets are not incompatible with a small stream, as *ευρροος*, *καλιγρροος*, &c. I have also shewn that in winter the *united streams*, were often very considerable, and that the Scamander in that part was *ποταμος*, *μεγας*, *δινηεις*, *βαθυδινος*, &c.

NOTES.

* Observations, p. 61.—† Observations, p. 61.

‡ Observations p. 62; and Expostulation p. 102

and amply justified all these epithets. Now a very exact idea of its size *above the confluence* may be gathered from many passages in Homer, which are diametrically opposite to Mr. Bryant's supposition, and are so particular, that they are worth a hundred epithets. A single tree torn down by Achilles formed a bridge across it, which is thus described: *

Ο δὲ Πηλεΐην ἔλε κερσιν
Εὐφρέα, μεγάλην, ἣ δ' ἐκ ριζῶν ἐριπῶσα
Κρημνὸν ἅπαντα διῶσεν ἐπέσχε δὲ καλὰ ῥέεθρα.

It also appears from several passages, that it was fordable† near the Camp, therefore not very far from the Sea, a circumstance totally inconsistent with the character Mr. Bryant wishes to assign to the river. Of these intimations he takes little or no notice, but they are to be reconciled to the epithets given us by ‡ Homer, and in order to do it, I supposed that the *μεγας ποταμος βαθυδινης* and the other sounding epithets of Homer, were allusive of the size and raging of the stream *in winter, below the confluence*; and that the facts, which prove the Scamander to have been less considerable, either happened *in Summer*, when the water from the Simois failed, or took place *above the confluence*. Should this solution not be deemed satisfactory, perhaps some other may be given, but none is admissible, which supposes the Scamander to be larger than Monf. Chevalier describes it, since it will be inconsistent with

NOTES.

* Homer, Il. φ. v. 242.—† Homer, Il. φ. v. 1, and passim.

‡ Indeed in Il. φ. v. 1. and *seq.* in the very place where he mentions the *ford* of the *Xanthus*, he calls the river *δινεις*, and almost immediately after *βαθυδροος αργυροδινης*; yet it is a fordable stream. So we see that according to Homer even a ford may be called *δινεις*, &c. but Mr. Bryant says afterwards, “ this Xanthus is only an arm of the Scamander, which last river was *never* *forded* ;” being *δινεις*, *βαθυδροος*, &c. See *Expostulation*, p. 109.

Homer's description where he is most precise; and such a charge of inconsistency ought to be founded on surer grounds than a poetical epithet. Let us also consider the nature and comparative size of the other river, the Simois. * I had quoted a passage from Pope's version of Homer, (referring to the greek in the notes,) in which the *Xanthus* (as I said,) implores the aid of his ally, the Simois :

Haste my brother flood,
And check this mortal, who controuls a God :
Call then your subject streams, and bid them roar ;
From all your fountains swell your watry store,
With broken rocks, and with a load of dead,
Charge the black surge, and pour it on his head.

This is perhaps rather a loose version, but the sense is nearly the same, and in the very next page I had given a part of the original, most material to my purpose. I quoted also two lines of Pope from the twelfth book, which either I or the printer made the seventh :†

And gulphy Simois rolling to the main,
Helmets and shields and godlike heroes slain.

In these two descriptions, I said, the Simois was characterised as a violent unequal mountain torrent, rolling down in his “ black surge,”

NOTES.

* Vindication, p. 88.

† Hom. M. 22. Και ΣΙΜΟΕΙΣ οδι πολλὰ βοαγρία και τρυφαλεια
καππεσον εν κοινητιν και ημιθεον γεγος ανδραν.

Mr. Bryant supposed Pope's two lines to be a version of mine, and concluded that I had mistaken the Scamander for the Simois, as the Scamander is mentioned in the 7th Book. I neither wrote the lines, nor was I guilty of the blunder.

stones, trees and dead bodies. But in the original, Mr. Bryant says, * “ we find not the *least intimation* of a mountain torrent, nor of broken rocks, nor load of dead, nor of this black surge.” The original is

† Ἰση δὴ μεγά κυμα πολὺν δ' ὀρυμαγδὸν ὄρει
Φιτρῶν καὶ λαῶν.

“ Lift up your mighty wave, and raise a great uproar of trunks of trees and Rocks,” I certainly quoted Pope as most familiar to many readers, but I should be glad to know whether the *μεγά κυμα, πολὺς ὀρυμαγδός* *φιτρῶν καὶ λαῶν*, is not just as conclusive, with respect to the size and nature of Simois, as any thing I have said. ‡ I believe Pope made a blunder in translating *λαῶν* a load of dead, as supposing it the genitive plural of *λαός*; but, when I mentioned the *dead bodies*, I alluded to the *ἡμιθέων γεῖος ἀνδρῶν* in the 12th book. What further proves, it is said, that I was entirely misled by Mr. Pope, is my calling the Scamander the Xanthus. It is very true, and so does Homer repeatedly, who tells us they were synonymous,

μεγας ποταμος βαθυδινης

Οὔ ΞΑΝΘΟΝ καλεοῦσι θεοὶ ἀνδρες τε ΣΚΑΜΑΝΔΡΟΝ. Υ. 74.

But, what shews that I consulted at least some other translation besides Pope's, is, that I translated *φίτρων*, trunks of trees, which are not mentioned in *his* version. Nor did I, in the second quotation, mistake the Simois for the Scamander, since the Simois is named in the original. Now this river, is very seldom mentioned in the Iliad, but the Scamander very frequently; because the Scamander lay directly between the Grecian Camp, and the field of

NOTES.

* Observations, p. 63.—† Hom. φ. v. 308. &c.

‡ *Λαός* certainly never means *dead* people.

battle, and because, below the junction, and near the Camp it was still called Scamander. Its fountains also are mentioned near Troy; the Simois was more remote from the Scene of action, and as the river is never crossed by either party, it is possible, that these reasons might have induced Homer to mention it less frequently than the other, without any reference to their comparative size. I have throughout used the terms Xanthus and Scamander indifferently, but in the expostulation to the British Critic Mr. Bryant gives us a * map of the Grecian Station, and a description of it according to the Poet, which agrees so exactly with my conceptions, excepting in the distance he assigns to Troy, and the difference he makes between the Xanthus and Scamander, that I must avail myself of his concessions, since I think they completely prove the truth of my own narration. † The situation of the Camp and the Ships was bounded to the left by the River Scamander. At one end of the camp were the tents of Achilles, and the Myrmidons; to the right. At the other end, those of Ajax and his people; and, in the centre, were the tent and ship of Ulysses. Farther, in p. 106, the Scamander, we find, is represented by Strabo, as resembling the Greek letter Υ , for it had two streams above, the Simois and Xanthus, which, at last, united, and fell into (or rather formed) the main river below. Of these, the Simois was to the left; the other, the Xanthus, to the right. As the Grecian Camp lay upon the ‡ right bank of the Scamander (for the left of the Camp was bounded by the river), the Xanthus was at some distance higher up, and opposite to it, and its fords lay in the way to Troy, and from it—Here was the chief scene of battle. Μεσσηνίης Σιμοεντος

NOTES.

* P. 104.—† Expostulation, p. 102. *et seq.*

‡ By the *right* bank Mr. Bryant evidently means the bank to the right of a person looking up the river. This is usually called the left bank of the river, but the context fully explains the expression; and I would not wish to cavil about words.

ιδε Ξανθοιο ποταμών. In page 109, Mr. Bryant says, the Scamander was never forded by the Greeks, it was only the *Xanthus*, an arm of the chief stream. Mr. Bryant then calls neither of the rivers *Scamander*, above the confluence; *an error of which he had already accused me, and of which I had never been guilty. Now Homer positively says, the *Xanthus* and *Scamander* were the same; and it may be proved, since many battles were fought between the *Xanthus* and the *Simois*; and the conflux is described to be that of the *Simois* and *Scamander*. Juno and Minerva descend Ἠχίροαυς Σιμοίσις συμέαλλετον ἠδὲ ΣΚΑΜΑΝΔΡΟΣ. Therefore the *Simois*, or the river on the left, was not the *Scamander*; and if so, the *Xanthus* was, since the name was retained above the confluence. This confluence took place, according to Mr. Bryant, *immediately* under the city, because it is said that the two Goddesses Τροίην ἔξον, but Τροίη is sometimes used, not merely for the city, but the district, for in the 9th Book Achilles says,

Δωδεκα συν νηυσὶ πόλεις ἄλαπαξ ἄνθρωπων
Πεζος δ' ἐνδεκα φημὶ κατὰ Τροίην ἐριβώλον.—Il. I. 328.

This passage Mr. Bryant himself refers to in the Observations, page 70. Besides, if, in fact, the city stood *at the* confluence, how could two armies fight between the rivers in *front* of the city? Since then the *Scamander* and *Xanthus* were the same, and the city higher up than Mr. Bryant places it, in every other point his description corresponds to the map I have given exactly; for what I have marked as the old bed of the *Scamander*, was his *Xanthus*, before the course was turned, and it lay directly between Troy and the Grecian camp; Achilles's station I have supposed at the *Sigæan*, and, therefore, on the right; the left I have bounded by the river, for which I have now Mr. Bryant's own authority. Mr. Bryant

NOTE.

* See Observations, p. 61.

adds, * “ From this evidence we learn, that the Grecian camp and the river Xanthus, and particularly it's fords, also the city Troy itself, were, in respect to each other, nearly in a direct line from the sea upwards.” In every part of this inference, I have the greatest satisfaction in having my map so very ably supported.

The situation of the two rivers in the plain of Bounarbachi, agrees then sufficiently with Homer's description; but Mr. Bryant says, that the situation of the plain itself is incompatible with it; because the City of Troy stood in this Plain, and † there are good reasons to believe it was near to Troas and Mount Lectum, and in view of the island Tenedos to the South. Now, that the plain of Troy was bounded by the Hellespont is evident, from many passages in the Iliad; and the Hellespont is far to the North of Troas, and Lectum. If then ‡ the Hellespont of Homer was the same as that of every other Greek writer, (and that it was not, has never been proved, though Mr. Bryant has attempted it,) there remains for us to consider; whether such a situation upon these celebrated straits, is really consistent with the other passages of the Iliad, which mention Lectum and Gargarus. § Lectum is the promontory, which forms the northern point of the Sinus Adramytenus; the deep bay in which Antandros and Adramyttium were situated. || Gargarus is the summit of the same ridge, of which Lectum is the extremity; and that ridge bounds the whole side of the bay in a line from West to East, turning Northward, at the Eastern

NOTES.

* Expositiō, p. 107.—† Observations, p. 64, *et passim*.

‡ See Vindication, p. 80, where the epithets and situation of Homer's Hellespont are taken into consideration. See also Bryant on the War of Troy, p. 157.

§ See Strabo, l. 13. p. 583.—|| Id. *ibid*.

end of the Bay. * Gargarus was also the highest summit of Ida, and † at no great distance from Antandros. Farther on in the same ridge was another summit called ‡ Cötylus, and the northern point where the mountains approached the Hellespont was called Dardanús. This whole chain of mountains went by the general name of Ida, which however appears sometimes to be appropriated to § Gargarus as the highest summit of the chain. That Lectum and Gargarus are *not* the same, is evident; since Lectum is by no means the highest point of Ida, but is only a rocky promontory, which terminates that mountain. From Lectum the mountains gradually rise on the East, and this rise terminates in a high point about half way between Lectum and the bottom of the gulph, at about twenty-five miles distance from each. This point is still the Summit of this branch of Ida, and is therefore sufficiently apparent, and there is no higher summit nearer Lectum, therefore it is impossible to make Gargarus, and Lectum, nearer than twenty-five miles, since the lasting features of nature will not bend to our Systems. The South side of Ida falls from Gargarus very rapidly down to the gulph of Adramyttium. I landed in this part near a village called Nara, and crossed over the mountain to Alexandria; this summit of Ida was on our right hand; it was pointed out by the inhabitants; and indeed it is as well known as the summit of any mountain in Switzerland or Wales. If Gargarus then was the highest point of this ridge, it was here. Now this point is a considerable distance from the plain of Bounarbachi; but it is in sight of the plain, and I have given in one of the Plates ||

NOTES.

* Servius, Notes on Virgil, *Æn.* 9, 86. Now it is possible that the summit of a mountain should be twenty-five or thirty miles from its extremity, and it frequently happens.

† Hesychius, as quoted by Mr. Bryant, *Observations*, p. 65.

‡ Homer's *Il.* passim. So Herodotus: *Την Ἰδὴν λαβὼν εἰς ἀριστερὴν χερσὶ.* L. 70. 42.

§ See *Vindication*, p. 116.—|| *Annexed to the Vindication*, p. 84.

a view

a view of it * from the Sigæan promontory, in the out-line of which it is a considerable feature. When Jupiter therefore views the plain and the ships of the Grecians from this summit, there is *nothing strange* in Homer's description, because they were all in sight ; and here † Mr. Bryant remarks, that I. " *believe in Jupiter*, and his superior faculty of sight," because I attribute to him optics which are evidently superior to those of men. My Paganism, however, *fully* proved, has, I conceive, nothing to do with the question ; Homer gives the all-seeing Jupiter an exalted station on the summit of Ida ; the image is grand, consistent and poetical. The point from which Jupiter takes his view of the plain does in fact command it, and therefore I can find no reason why we should conclude from the situation of Gargatis, ‡ that the plain was farther to the South, and that Troy stood near Alexandria Troas. Homer does not insinuate any thing about the distance of Gargarus, when he tells us the plain was seen from it by Jupiter. I certainly conceive the Eye of Homer's Jupiter to have been very strong and piercing, and cannot argue from the Eyes of Men in this case, whatever idea Mr. Bryant may form of my belief in the Grecian Mythology. § Cer-

NOTES.

* Vindication, p. 84.

Jupiter viewed the city *πρὸς Ἀχαιῶν*, which Mr. Bryant says were, according to my position, a great way beyond Ilium, and therefore (because I argue from Strabo that Ilium was in sight of Gargarus,) that I am guilty of *a dissingenuous evasion*, in directing Jupiter's view to *a nearer object*. There is no evasion in the drawing, which is taken *very near the Shore*, nor is Ilium much nearer ; for the town I mean is new Ilium, mentioned by Strabo, l. 13, p. 605, which was only a mile, or a mile and a half from the Port of the Greeks, and the mouth of the Scamander. See Observations, p. 70.

† Observations, p. 69.

‡ Mr. Bryant tells us in another place, that Ilion, according to Homer, was *τηλοῦσι*, a considerable distance from Ida ;—does not this ruin his own argument ? Observations, p. 54.

§ Hom. Il. N. 20. Neptune strode at four strides from Salamis to Agæ ; Mr. Bryant therefore must either suppose that mortal men walked about much quicker in these days than they do now, or he must allow superior power to Homer's Neptune ; and implicate himself in this same dreadful Sin of Polytheism.

tainly,

tainly, Neptune's four strides are more disproportionate to human power than Jupiter's Eyesight. [The plain of Bounarbachî is, therefore, in a situation sufficiently agreeable to Homer's description of the plain of Troy ; and Strabo, * with all the best Geographers, supposed them to be the same. What puts it beyond a doubt that it was not farther South is, that there is no plain nearer Gargarus, and no rivers of any size. † Mr. Bryant certainly mistook the nature of the streams near Alexandria, if either from Pocock's description, or any other, he could for a moment imagine them to be described by Homer, either as the Simois or Xanthus. They are mere springs that rise above and supply some baths, and are not large enough (as Belon owns,) for a goose to swim in even in Winter. I have inserted *this* ‡ “ river” as Mr. Bryant calls it, in my Map ; but I thought the size could not be mistaken, as I have described it in the § Vindication, and as Chevalier gives a full account of it. || “ *There it stands then in my Map,—indelible,*” and in my book stands the description of it, and both are equally “ *obvious to any person who will look after them : There also it stands in Chevalier,* and in his book too ; yet because we mark a *water course* near Alexandria, and in our writings deny the existence of a river there, Mr. Bryant asks, “ How we can be expected to understand Homer, since we do not understand our own meaning ?”

The whole of the argument, as far as it relates to Homer's description of the situation of the plain, seems to me to amount to this. If, according to Homer, the scene of the Iliad must necessarily be transferred to the vicinity of Lectum, and Gargarus, the whole of this description is (as Mr. B. justly observes in this supposition,)

NOTES.

* Strabo, l. 13, p. 595, x.7.2.—† Expostulation, p. 98.—‡ Expostulation, p. 99.

§ Vindication, p. 82, and Chevalier, p. 7.—|| See the Expostulation, p. 100.

purely *ideal* ; since the country is in every respect totally different from the region described. The only proof of its vicinity to Gargarus, which Mr. Bryant has adduced from Homer's writings, is, that he places Jupiter upon that summit to view the plain. Admitting the fact, I deny the conclusion ; and as a proof on the other side, I observe, that Homer certainly places the plain on the shore of the *Hellepont*. Since in this situation we find a plain and two rivers in every respect agreeing with Homer's account, the scene of the *Iliad* was not ideal ; and one argument against the historical truth of the Poem is thereby taken away.

The plain of Bounarbachi, and the ancient courses of the two rivers, which are found there, correspond with the plain of ancient Troy, and the description afforded by the *Iliad* of the Simois and Xanthus, or Scamander. Here also we find the * *Thymbrius* mentioned by Homer, and several tombs, which agree in a very extraordinary manner, (considering the number of ages which have intervened,) with all that Homer has said of the tombs of the Grecian and Trojan heroes. Surely these additional corroborating circumstances cannot be entirely passed over ; and they outweigh any inference, that can be drawn from the Eyesight which Homer allots to Jupiter. It remained then to fix the situation of Troy, and in this I have followed Mr. Chevalier ; not " blindly," nor " implicitly ;" but because I thought him right in the situation he assigned to the city ; at the same time that I thought he carried the walls on the South and East side too far back. I had said, that Bounarbachi † was set above a short ascent upon a plain ; the plain in which the rivers run is below it, on the North and on the West, and the difference of

NOTES.

* Now the Thimbreck. See Chevalier, and the Vindication.

† See Vindication, p. 93, *et seq.*

level between these two plains is not considerable. The flat ground behind Bounarbachi is delineated in the view taken from the tomb of Hector, as well as the larger plain below; and the slope between these two plains is also delineated in the view taken from the cold spring of the Scamander, as well as the much higher hill in the right hand of the picture, on the top of which the tombs of Hector and the other Trojan warriors are supposed to be situated. This high hill bounds the upper plain on the South and South-East, and behind it runs the Simois in a deep dell, with high rocky precipices, which cease just to the East of Bounarbachi, and terminate in the slight acclivity above which the village stands, with a level plain behind it, extending to the foot of the hills that rise on the South. I do not place Troy "*high up beyond*" * Bounarbachi, but I believe it to have occupied what is now the situation of that village, and to have extended behind, and on each side of it, over great part of the flat table land between the lower plain, and the hills on the South. Part of the City might also have extended along the bank of the Simois on the North, and North-East, into the lower plain; Troy, however, is here *ενπεδιω*, on a plain, which in fact does not terminate but at the high range of hills, on which, I conceive, the Acropolis to have stood. Homer said the city was *τηλοθι*, "a great way" from Mount Ida, I agree with him. † Mount Ida, properly so called, rises far behind the hills of Bounarbachi, which I have shewn in what I said about Gargarus. But if Jupiter sat on

NOTES.

* Some Observations, &c. p. 53. The word Bounarbachi signifies the "head of a Stream;" and, therefore, the reader will not imagine the village to be on the top of a hill above a mile from the sources which it takes its name from.

† Mr. Bryant himself allows that Homer's Ida is properly the same as *Gargarus*; but in fact in the place quoted, the words are *τηλοθι δὴ λη.*

Ἀξέμεν ἐξορτασε. Ω 662.

"We bring wood from the mountain from a considerable distance." The woody parts of the mountain might be at some distance without any just inference as to the distance of the mountain itself.

Ida, and Troy, according to Homer, was *τηλεθι* a great way from it, what becomes of the whole argument founded on the immediate vicinity of Gargarus and Lectum? I had tried in the *Vindication to strengthen my argument by a supposition, that the wall ran along the slope below Bounarbachi, and then above the springs cut across the flat platform, on which it is situated to the foot of the higher hills. I had observed, that in this case, if the Scæan Gate stood above the springs, the wall to the South of the Gate would cross over a level plain from the top of one slope to the bottom of a much higher, that here was probably the *ερινεος*. *Ενθα μαλιστα αμβατος εστι πολις κ' επιδρομον επλετο τειχος*. *Επιδρομος*, is rendered by some lexicographers *accessu facilis, planus*;† which I accounted for by shewing, that according to my plan, the wall which every where else was upon an acclivity, here would be upon a level plain. The whole of this passage was, therefore, misunderstood by Mr. Bryant, or he would not have censured me so severely as he has done in his Observations, page 53, and 54; but it is very difficult sometimes to describe situations by words, and the obscurity and confusion of my description, no doubt, misled him. I certainly intended no *evasion* or *duplicity* here, and I hope I have explained my meaning to his satisfaction.

I have already noticed many other particulars, in which this assigned situation agrees with Homer, so I will not recapitulate them here. It is only my business to take away the objections, that have since been made; particularly, where any misconception may

NOTES.

* Page 96.

† Stephanus renders it *expositus ταις επιδρομαις, incursonibus*. I translated it *level*, or *easily accessible*; Mr. Bryant says that it means *easily over-run*, or *easily ascended*. But *επι* means—"close up to," as well as "locally upon," as I have shewn; (Vindication, p. 95.) and in composition, I apprehend, it may be rendered in that sense. *Επιδρομος* may mean *easy to be approached*, as well as "*easy to be ascended*;" and it is in fact so understood by Stephanus.

have originated from my want of perspicuity. In my Map * I am told, that the fountains of Scamander are a long mile from Bounarbachi, and Troy still higher; however my book corrected the inaccuracy of my Map, for I repeatedly state that the † Scæan Gate was *immediately* above these springs, and in the ‡ view taken from the springs Bounarbachi is delineated as it really is, greatly within half that distance. If then it was nine miles and a half from the springs (and consequently the Scæan Gate,) to the Sigean promontory, § I argued that it would not be more than seven or eight miles to the nearest part of the camp; and, that a less distance than is here assigned would be scarcely sufficient for the two armies to encamp and march, or for the different events to take place, which are recorded in Homer's poem. Assuming the hot spring as a mark of the situation of the Scæan gate, I have conjectured the situation of the city. Certainly no ruins remain; but as I have stated, the ground in some parts appears to have been built upon; and many other cities are equally destroyed without the same causes of destruction. It suffices then to have shewn that this situation, in other respects, agrees with Homer, and that no other situation in the plain does, since the Scæan gate must be near the springs. This has, I trust, been done, and if so the scenery of the Iliad is founded on reality; and Homer, at least, adapted his story to the geography of Phrygia.

In the Vindication I had ventured an opinion that Strabo in person never visited the Troad, and I founded that opinion, not on his contradicting my hypothesis, but on his contradicting himself more than once, and on his frequent references to Demetrius of Scepsis.

NOTES.

* Observations, p. 55.—† See Vindication. Plate.—‡ Vindication, p. 97, *et passim*.

§ Vindication, p. 110.

Whether he was in the Troad or not however, he describes a great part of it with the utmost accuracy. * Mr. Bryant says that “ the author of the Vindication, (M. Morritt,) and his *friend*, (Mr. Chevalier,) act very politicly in depreciating Strabo, however high his authority ; for if he is to be trusted, almost every article which they have maintained is wrong.” I beg the reader’s attention while I shew from Strabo, “ if he is trusted,” how many articles which we have maintained are right, and those chiefly articles, for which he does not cite Demetrius ; and which, if he was there, were apparently his own observations. † In tracing the coast of the Hellespont, he comes to Dardanus ; a city seventy stadia distant from Abydos, on a promontory of the same name. Between this city and Abydos he places the river Rhodius ; and opposite to its mouth, in the Thracian Chersonesus, the Cynos-fema, or tomb of Hecuba. Near Dardanus is Ophrynum, on which stood a grove consecrated to Hector, and then he comes to the *lake Pteleos*. ‡ I always thought the Geography of this part of the country sufficiently ascertained by D’Anville, and the § travellers who have visited the Hellespont, and as it was not the immediate object of my book, I gave the plan of the coast no higher than the point I suppose the Rhæteum. || Here, however, Mr. Bryant says I have, to all appearance, mistaken the Rhodius for the Scamander ; and adds, that the lake Pteleos is by Strabo placed just *where the nearest land appears now near Ophrynum*, which seems to be the Cape Janifary of the moderns, which they have considered as the ancient Sigeum. Between the Rhodius and Ophrynum stood ¶ Dardanus ; a part of Ida with the city Dardanus upon it. Where is this mountain and city ? certainly not

NOTES.

* Observations, p. 59.—† Strabo, 13 ; 595, κ. τ. λ.

‡ This then is the order given by Strabo, in which the places he mentions were ranged along the coast from Abydos southward :—Abydos, Rhodius, Dardanus acra, Dardanus, Ophrynum.

§ Sandys, Pocock, Chandler, &c.—|| Observations, p. 56, 57, &c.—¶ See Strabo *ad. loc.*

between Cape Janifary and the river we describe. This single fact destroys the whole hypothesis; but if any one will consult D'Anville's plan, given by Bocage in the Voyage D'Anacharsis, and compare it with the modern Map of Greece by De La Rochette, who is however less exact than D'Anville, he will see that these places are placed higher up, and consistently with Strabo's description. Abydos is a situation still known; the traces of its foundations are scattered over the side of a hill, and a massy fragment of its wall stands on the shore. The narrowness of the Hellespont near this place marks its situation as well that of Sestos. As I made the journey by land from the Troad to the Dardanelles, and afterwards went to Abydos, and returned by sea to the Troad, I can assure the reader that the outline of the Hellespont, as given by D'Anville, and La Rochette, is tolerably exact; near the modern town of the Dardanelles, where the Asiatic fortrefs of the Turks is situated, * a large and rapid river runs into the sea; it is about five miles from Abydos, and therefore as Dardanus is at about nine miles, or seventy stadia, it would be between the two. This then must be the Rhodius, for if Dardanus was beyond the other river we call the Scamander, it would be near twenty miles from Abydos. A little below this river, which runs in a plain, the mountain of Ida borders the Hellespont, and we know Dardanus was the name of this extremity of Ida. † Ophrynum was “*πλησιον, near it* ;” how then could it be at Cape Janifary? in fact, Ophrynum was another promontory of Ida which here juts into the sea. This part of the country corresponds completely with Strabo, and the Cynossema is directly opposite the mouth of the Rhodius, for at its foot is built the European Castle of the Dardanelles, directly opposite the Asiatic,

NOTES.

* This is the river Leunclavius seems to have mistaken for the Simois. See Notes on Chevalier, p. 102.

† Strabo, *loc. suprac.*

which stands on the Rhodius, (now the Dardanelle river). Near it are Madytos and Koilos, now Maita and Koilia, and beyond them the promontory of Sestos. The Cynossema is a high promontory, and upon it there still remains a tomb exactly similar to the *tumuli* of the Troad, as I had already mentioned *in the Vindication. (See page 107.) Now these promontories and rivers agree with Strabo, and are totally inconsistent with every attempt to convert the rivers of the plain of Bounarbachî, and the Cape Janîfari into the Rhodius and Ophrynum; and when † Mr. Bryant considers that this larger river was Strabo's Scamander, (for, certainly, it washes Palæ Scepsis, and receives the Andrius of that author,) he must entirely abandon his opinion. ‡ He declares, however, that the marshes which exist to the east of Koumkalé in the plain, were undoubtedly the Pteleos of Strabo. Let us see how Strabo continues his description of the coast, having first premised that some very marshy land exists nearer Dardanus. After Pteleos is *Ροίθειον πόλις ἐπὶ λοφωκείμενῃ*, Rhœteum a city on a hill; (beyond the marshes on the west there are no hills;) also at Rhœteum was a tomb on the shore, called Aiantium, with a fane and monument of Ajax. The remains of this tomb, and the foundations of this very fane, exist, and mark the Rhœtean promontory; and the tomb is proved to be the same Strabo mentioned, being situated near the shore, and broken open in the very manner described by Pausanias, who also takes notice of it. Here is also *λοφος*, a rising ground on which the city stood, and therefore Pteleos was not in the plain, but undoubtedly nearer to Dardanus. These marshes in the plain are mentioned

NOTES.

* Vindication, p. 107.—† Observations, p. 57.

‡ Strabo thus continues his description: Pteleos—Rhœteum—Aiantium—Sigeum—Naustathmus Achivorum—[*Λίμνη*.] Portus Achivorum—Castrâ Achiv.—Stoma limne—Scamandri ostia, Sigeias Acra, opposite the Chersonesus. Achæum, a promontory commanding the shore of Tenedos, and the plain of Troy lying inland above all these places towards Ida.

by Strabo, however, under a different name. “ Beyond the Rhœteum, he says is Sigeum, a city now ruined, and the Naval station and the port of the Greeks, and the Grecian camp, and a marsh called Stoma, and the mouths of the Scamander. For the Simois and Scamander joining in the plain, bringing down a quantity of mud in their course heap up the shore, and form τοφλον σωμα τε καὶ λιμνη θηλαττας καὶ ἐλη.” This blind mouth, and salt marshes formed by the Scamander, are not then the lake Pteleos, nor were they ever confounded with it. Then Strabo mentions the Sigean promontory, and the tomb of Proteſilaus which stood opposite to it in the Thracian Chersonesus; but as Cape Janifary is the last point opposite Thrace, if Ophrynum was here, Sigeum was more to the South, and not opposite the Chersonesus, nor near it. In short, there is not one reason in Strabo for placing either Ophrynum or Pteleos in this part, and inexplicable confusion would result from it. The objects mentioned above, Sigeum (the city,) the Naval station, &c. all come in between Rhœteum, and the Sigean promontory ἀκρὰ Σιγείας, on which he places the tomb of Achilles, and near it those of Patroclus and Antilochus. Hitherto then if Strabo is to be trusted, the articles Chevalier and I have maintained are not wrong. Perhaps also some others will be found equally consonant to his evidence. In one point, however, we both of us differ from him. * For, says he, “ the length of this shore from the Rhœteum to the Sigæan promontory, and tomb of Achilles, is sixty stadia.” † Pliny says thirty, and this number agreeing with the breadth of the plain, and being supported in our conjectures about the site of the Rhœteum by the existence of the broken tumulus above mentioned, we supposed that Strabo’s text might here be defective,

NOTES.

* Strabo, *ibid.*

† Pliny says the distance from the Aiantium was thirty stadia, which Strabo places at the Rhœtean Promontory. Plin. Hist. Natur. l. 5. cap. 30.

since

since it depends on a Greek numeral; and we adopted the measurement of Pliny as more consonant to truth; *but we gave our reasons for fixing the Rhœteum near the tomb of Ajax, and also for supposing the broken tumulus now seen on the shore to be that tomb, as described by Strabo himself and Pausanias. I apprehend, that this correction of Strabo's measurement, by the existing topography of the country, supported by the authority of Pliny, is agreeable to the exactest rules of geographical criticism. Indeed the *εξεκοντα σταδια* of Strabo are doubtful, since other manuscripts have substituted *εβδομηκοντα* in some copies, and Eustathius proposes to read *επτα*. A doubtful reading is best corrected by the real geography of the Plain, and the comparison with another author; especially in Strabo, where the text is in general acknowledged to have been much mutilated. "The whole of this coast then," says Strabo, "lies below Ilium; it being about twelve stadia from the present town of that name to the Port of the Grecians; from the ancient Ilium it is thirty stadia more, measured upwards towards the region of Ida." The exact situation of New Ilium has not yet been ascertained I believe. I own I have little doubt that it was above the junction, for †in Pliny we find that New Ilium was a Roman mile and a half from the Port, that is certainly from *the shore*; and I believe this word *Portu* refers to the *Portus Achivorum* mentioned three lines before; as it agrees exactly with the twelve stadia of Strabo, both here, and in p. 598. ‡New Ilium was also twenty Stadia distant from the mouth of the Simois; and below the junction there does not appear to have been room for a considerable city, and also for these distances from the shore. No part of the shore is now much above twenty stadia from the junction, therefore I am inclined strongly to believe the city stood above it. I

NOTES.

* Vind. p. 105—110. Chevalier, p. 107.—† Plin. Hist. Nat. L. 5. Chap. 30.

‡ Strabo. L. 13. p. 598.

think also, but with great diffidence, that the word * *εμπροσθεν* means *in front of* New Ilium, and that this is the more classical sense of the word, which more frequently, I believe, is used with reference to place than to time, and I conceive Strabo to view the country from the shore as he usually does. This situation above the Confluence was first suggested by the learned author of the British Critick, who notices it p. 35, and is further strengthened as he justly observes, by the existence of the ancient Bridge, marked in Mr. Wood's map, † which is above the confluence. I could not find any certain traces of the city itself, such as foundations, or walls undoubtedly ancient, either above or below the junction; many pieces of ancient sculpture, and remains of ancient magnificence are now stuck without order in the walls of one or two poor villages in this part of the plain, above the junction; a certain proof of the vicinity of some ancient monuments. "Going forward a little beyond this shore Strabo says you come to Achæum, which commands the shore of Tenedos. The plain of Troy lies above these places on the shore, stretching eastward for many stadia as far as Ida. That part near the mountains is narrow, partly extending on the South side to the vicinity of Scepsis, (this certainly is the description of the narrow dell in which the Simois runs.) ‡ partly on the North side to the Lycians of Zeleia. (This I conceive to be the valley of the Thymbrius.) This place the poet says was subject to Æneas and the sons of Antenor, and he calls it Dardania." Now hitherto, except in the distance of Troy, I completely agree with Strabo. I think it cannot be said, that if he is right

NOTES.

* Strabo says the confluence of the rivers was *εμπροσθεν του ιλιου*, L. 13. p. 597.

† Though Mr. Chevalier does not insert this bridge in his map, he mentions it in his Book, p. 24. The bridge certainly does exist in that situation as he describes it.

‡ See the map annexed to the Vindication, or that of Chevalier.

almost every article I have maintained is wrong. With respect to the situation of the city, I differ from his authority however respectable, because it appears not to agree with the description left us by Homer. *The two sources of the Scamander rose near the road in front of the Scæan gate; Troy therefore was above these sources in the plain. But these sources are found much higher up than the village of the Ilions, which Strabo conjectured, perhaps from some vague tradition, to have been at or near the situation of ancient Ilium. It has also been shewn by M. Chevalier, that Strabo had assigned it a different situation in another passage, p. 892. For he had there said, that “from the mountainous part of Ida two *αγῶνες*, or projecting ranges of hills, stretch to the sea, one towards Rhœteum, the other towards the Sigeum, in a semicircular direction; but they terminate about the same distance from the Sea with New Ilium.” By this *termination*, I fancy the point of their *greatest projection* whence they retire to the Sea, is alluded to; since he had already said they run to the sea, which would not happen if they ceased at new Ilium. Indeed New Ilium is nearly in the narrowest part of the plain, and this description agrees entirely with the plain of Bounarbachi. But Strabo says, that New Ilium stood indeed at the *termination* of this range, but ancient Ilium stood at their *commencement*. Therefore according to him, it stood at the foot of the mountains of †Ida; and Bounarbachi is found there, but the village of the Ilions (if Strabo’s thirty stadia are exactly measured) stood lower down in the vale, and lower than the springs;

NOTES.

* Hom. Il. X. 147. Mr. Bryant has explained this passage differently, but as Strabo evidently considers it as descriptive of the *sources* of the Scamander, even while he owns the Scamander of Demetrius did not agree with Homer’s description; I must consider him as the better Commentator of the two. Strabo, L. 13. p. 602.

† Ida is here used as the general name of the whole range. Homer sometimes uses it in a more confined sense.

which position would be inconsistent with Homer's description, and also with the situation assigned to Troy, by Strabo's own conjecture in the passage above quoted. Surely a greater attention is to be paid to this excellent geographer's positive description of the features of nature, than to any measurements he gives; since besides the frequent corruptions of Greek numerals which have happened from the carelessness of transcribers, we know that computed distances are often extremely vague and erroneous even now, and we know not that they are here assigned by actual measurement. Besides, if New Ilium was of any extent, suppose for example, two or three miles above the confluence, thirty stadia further might bring us not very far short of the situation assigned by us. In this uncertainty however it cannot be said, that if Strabo is to be trusted we are wrong, since we agree in every thing but in the length of these thirty stadia, and in that part we have shewn that he contradicts himself. " These two ranges of hills enclosed the vallies of Scamander and of Simois; and this enclosed part is properly called the plain of Troy, and was the scene of most of the Poet's Battles; he then * mentions the other monuments, and the conflux, and also the Stoma limne. See Strabo, p. 892. Chevalier, p. 63. He also mentions the Thymbrius, and this is still called Thimbreck, therefore cannot be mistaken; and then argues at some length that † New Ilium was not the seat of ancient Troy; as it clearly was not. He afterwards says, not a vestige remained of the ancient city, which he thinks very easily accounted for; (See Strabo p. 599. See Vindication, p. 72.) With regard to the passages for

NOTES.

* Strabo says *οραμεν*, 597, *we see* there the places mentioned by Homer, the Erineos, the tombs of Æfyetes, Myrinne, and Ilus, which are still shewn.

† This debate, says Mr. Bryant, shews that neither New Ilium nor the Pagus Iliensium had any pretensions to be considered as Troy. I think it appears that they had not, but yet some third spot might, for this uncertainty by no means proves the non-existence of any place.

which he cites Demetrius, and which induced me to think he had not visited the Troad, much has been said, they chiefly relate to the situation of places more inland, such as Scepsis, Æne, &c. Demetrius certainly supposed the river we called Simois to be the Scamander, but Strabo owns it had only one fountain, and did not agree with Homer. He then supposes the warm Spring lost; but even in that case it does not agree, since Troy stood near these springs; and he places the city many miles lower, where Ida terminates in the plain. Here then he is inconsistent with himself, and whenever that is the case, we must have recourse to the existing topography, and to other authorities, in order to clear up difficulties and remove doubts, if we really wish to illustrate Strabo and Homer. If however we wish to invalidate their evidence, the more doubts and difficulties we can accumulate the better. I only doubt Strabo's authority where he doubts it himself, or where other authors contradict him, and are more consonant to modern evidence.

I trust then, that I have at least shewn that Mr. Chevalier and I do not depreciate Strabo's account, from any *politick* motives assigned to us by Mr. Bryant. That the Scamander of that author was not, and could not be the Scamander of Homer, Mr. Bryant must acknowledge; since his own plan of the Simois and Xanthus contradicts it, and I have shewn that the Xanthus and Scamander of Homer were the same; the names had been changed after Homer's time, and hence originated all the confusion. If indeed the course of the original Scamander had been turned previous to Strabo's time (which is not impossible) the confusion may be accounted for, since the mouth being always called the *ostia Scamandri*, the name would naturally be retained all the way up, tho' the real Scamander no longer joined it. *Pliny however positively mentions the present Mouth of the

NOTE.

* See Hist. Natur. L. 5, Cap. 30.

Scamander South of Sigeum, and also the Palæ-Scamander, the ancient bed of the river, and the Simois on the North side. I trust then that we are supported in our conjectures by the most respectable authors of antiquity ; and certain it is, that Mr. Bryant's conjecture about Ophrynum, and the nap he gives of Troy near Læctum, is positively contradicted by them all, in numberless places ; and his situation of Ophrynum is, indeed, contradicted by himself. Allowing him therefore the authority of Virgil, *Est in conspectu Tenedos*, (which is not in sight from the plain, only on account of the height of the coast) and also of *Monf. Belon, who owns he could not find the rivers at Alexandria Troas ; I only oppose to them the authorities above mentioned, and upon that issue I rest the cause.

NOTE.

* Mr. Bryant adds to Belon, Sandys, Lithgow, and Gemelli ; Sandys however is entirely contrary to his supposition, for he landed at Cape Janifary, which he calls also the Sigæan promontory, to view the plain of Bounarbachi ; which he, with us, considered as the scene of " those renowned bickerings," the combats of the Greeks, and Trojans. He also places the ancient City of Ilion in this plain. He positively points out the mistake of Belon, with respect to the two rivers, which he observes in all likelihood had also taken place in the situation assigned by him to the city. " For the ruins (of Alexandria) described by him, stand too near the naval station, to afford a field for the events of the Iliad." He mentions the marshes in the plain, but, as he did not penetrate on land beyond Cape Janifary, he could not give the course of the Scamander, and the situation of Bounarbachi with accuracy. He places the plain and rivers in his map, opposite the Chersonese, and on the shore of the Hellespont ; and he no where confounds old Troy, which he places inland, with Alexandria Troas. What induced Mr. Bryant to assert that Sandys agreed with Belon, I cannot conceive. Lithgow certainly mistook Alexandria for Troy, and talks of the *ruins* of Priam's palace, and gives drawings of the tombs of Priam and Hecuba from these remains. His account is very singular, and his mistakes in some points evident ; why then should his authority be uncontrovertible ? Gemelli Careri saw the same ruins and landed on the shore, he says the ancient Troy was here, but he could not go inland as the haste of the Rais (or master of the ship who conducted him) prevented his longer stay. He never mentions the rivers or the plain. He afterwards calls the two castles of the Dardanelles, Sestos, and Abydos ; in which he is also entirely mistaken. Neither of these two travellers seem to have paid much attention to this part of the coast ; nor do they take any pains to ascertain the accuracy, or the defects of ancient topography. The manner of Sandys forms a striking contrast with theirs, and his testimony is throughout favourable to Mr. Chevalier's hypothesis ; indeed he was so learned, and so indefatigable, that his authority would hardly be disputed, and therefore it is of importance to shew that he agrees with us. Vide Sandys' Travels, p. 15. and *seq.* Lithgow, p. 122. Gemelli Careri, Vol. I. p. 233. French Edition.

In

In the description I have given of the plain of Bounarbachî, I fear I have also been accessory to some mistakes Mr. Bryant seems to have made, which it is therefore incumbent upon me to rectify. I have just shewn that Strabo mentioned an *accretion of land* at the mouth of the two rivers. I had said that Chevalier also mentioned it; but I had not referred to the passage. Mr. Bryant says that * “Not one word to the purpose is to be found in the author appealed to.” However in Chevalier’s description, p. 17. he expressly mentions Koumkalé, the *castle of the Sands*, so called because it is built “on the sands which are accumulated at the mouth of the torrent.” His learned Editor, Dalzel, has expressed his opinion on this subject very justly. † “It is not to be doubted,” he says “that the prominence of Soil now observable at the mouth of the river, is an accumulation of sand, gradually formed by the repeated torrents of the Simois upon the spot, which might have been a bay in the time of Homer, (Il. 7th, 462.) though the current of the rapid Hellespont must render it impossible for any accretion to be formed thereof the magnitude which Mr. Wood has fancied.” Mr. Wood supposes this increase at least twelve or thirteen miles, and certainly there is no contradiction in refusing our assent to that conjecture, and yet mentioning an accretion, which is allowed by Strabo, who says that the shore had increased six stadia from Homer’s time. But I had further observed ‡ that the nature of the ground was such as to confirm this idea of Strabo, Chevalier, and Dalzel, and I referred for the proof of it to the “drawing of that part of the plain, where the *long low points* of flat marshy ground *running forward* into the sea, sufficiently evince their origin.” Mr. Bryant is somewhat severe upon these § “long low points,” to which

NOTES.

* Observations, p. 53.—† Chevalier, pages 99, 100. See Note.

‡ See Vindication, p. 91, 109.—§ Some Observations, &c. p. 55, 56, 58.

he says I refer in the drawing of the map of Mr. Chevalier ; and argues that, “ no low, faint, imperceptible dots, and points, should be opposed to plain, intelligible writing.” To this I have only two words to say ; first, that Mr. Chevalier’s writing does *not* contradict me ; and secondly, that the *drawing* I refer to has nothing to do with any map, but was taken on the spot from the tomb of Ajax, and is engraved and given in my book after page 90. “ *Ibi omnis effusus labor.*” These points of marshy land do *run forward* into the Sea, and are evidently a deposit of mud, brought down by the rivers. * Mr. Bryant accuses me of artifice in this description, and says “ they may run backwards into the country.” I can only answer, that in a question of fact, having been on the spot, my authority is equal to Mr. Bryant’s, however inferior in every other respect ; that my drawing corroborates it, and the testimony of other Eyewitnesses is also in my favour. Indeed I had mentioned this accretion in commenting on this very plate, † and had there pointed out the form and origin of these long promontories. ‡ “ This swampy soil” he says, “ may be in some degree traced in the map of Mr. Chevalier, but is far more accurately described in that of Mr. Wood.” I am sorry to differ from Mr. Bryant also in this assertion ; Mr. Wood’s map of the coast is by no means so *accurate* as Mr. Chevalier’s, and how Mr. Bryant could in his Study estimate their comparative exactness, is to me entirely a secret. I am called on here § to answer a question Mr. Bryant calls an *untoward* one ; viz. how I came to apply to Mr. Chevalier for intelligence, and not to have been myself sufficiently informed on the subject of this marsh ? With all due deference I reply, that so far from applying to Mr. Chevalier, I refer to my own plate ; and that

NOTES.

* Some Observations, p. 56.

† Vindication, &c. p. 91.—‡ Some Observations, p. 57.—§ Some Observations, p. 58.

wherever

wherever I bring forward Chevalier's testimony, I make use of it to corroborate my own assertions. But this **friend* of mine (whom, by the way, I never saw in my life,) † had constructed, it seems, a most inaccurate map, which I copied, without considering that Troy was near the junction of the two streams, because Juno and Minerva Τροίηνες, near the conflux. This fact as to Troy, is answered already above; but, since Mr. Bryant considers our *agreement* as a proof that my map was a copy, I beg leave to ask him, what inference he would have drawn, if our maps had materially *disagreed*? In the ‡ 74th page however, Mr. Bryant says "in many respects Mr. Morritt's map differs from Chevalier's" (which is true), and then he concludes they were both the work of *fancy*; or *perhaps* of *recollection*; according to him then, first we *agree*, then we *disagree*, then my map is a *copy* from Mr. Chevalier's, then it was *not a copy* but a *work of fancy*. Obe jam satis.

That some errors and inaccuracies exist in my delineation of the country, and must exist, I am well aware. At the time I was in the Troad I was perfectly satisfied with Chevalier's description, and had no idea of the doubts which have since been started, on a subject which, in that situation, appeared to me incontestably decided. I had no instruments with me to make a geometrical survey of the plain, but I had Chevalier's map, and a compass. With these I observed the general outlines, and bearings of places, and corrected what seemed to me materially deficient; as for instance § the relative situation of the springs, and a few other points of that sort. Since I came home, I also conversed with Mr. Dallaway,

NOTES.

* Some Observations, p. 61.—† Some Observations, *passim*. —‡ See Observations.

§ See the two Maps.

who took a second rough survey of the plain, the year after he had been there with Mr. Stockdale and myself; furnished with these materials I could not hesitate about the map I gave, which was calculated to convey a good general idea of the plain, and was quite accurate enough to answer the purpose for which it was wanted; but I have no doubt that a more accurate survey may be taken, and I believe will still farther illustrate Homer. I must beg the reader's pardon for not having done this myself; but he will recollect that I knew nothing then of the doubts of English literati, or the objections Mr. Bryant had made to M. Chevalier; neither had I the least idea of a controversy on this subject, much less that I should take a part in it. I hoped also that my engravings would in some degree compensate for the inaccuracy of my map. I do not think, however, any blame attaches either upon Mr. Chevalier or myself, for giving a map of the plain and immediate environs as they *now* appear, instead of giving what Mr. Bryant seems to have expected, * a map of a whole district, including Dardanus, Cotylus, Gargarus, &c. For the the relative situation of these we must refer the reader to D'Anville, and other good geographers, particularly to † those who have been upon the spot. Neither were we bound to conjecture the situations of other ancient towns. But we have given merely the ‡ *topography* of Troy, and we have asserted that the Geography of the rest of the district furnishes no arms to combat our hypothesis; if it does, others may produce them. A similar objection may be made from the closet to every

NOTES.

* Some Observations, p. 51.—† See Chandler.

‡ In a map of Middlesex does any one object the omission of Surrey, Hertfordshire, or Berkshire, or does any one infer from thence that the map is erroneous, and would be proved so by a more extended survey? that survey should be taken, and the faults proved before the assertion is so boldly hazarded.

ancien

ancient map. *All this, you may say, is very plausible ; but why not give the country farther to the North, South, East, or West ? And then conclude that it “ is not *suffered to appear*, because it would ruin the author’s plan if admitted.” It is enough for me if the map is consistent with itself and with Homer. That it is at least more like the country it represents, than any other, formed (however ingeniously) by a fire-side in England, will, perhaps, to many readers seem highly probable. Of the mistakes made in his, however, Mr. Bryant says, I have not produced one instance ; when a map taken on the spot contradicts his in almost every point, one would think that those instances had been furnished, and perhaps in the most efficacious manner possible. Nor do I differ with M. Chevalier about the situation of Tenedos ; it is exactly where he placed it ; but it is not in my map, which was confined to the plain ; the scale I had made use of not admitting the island ; and I thought the objection arising from a line in Virgil not worth notice. Virgil never was looked on as an accurate geographer, and what he says is unsupported by other authorities. Tenedos is visible every where from the shore, and from the hills on which the Trojan tombs are found, but a range of low hills shuts out the plain from the Ægean.

As a very respectable and learned character has incurred Mr. Bryant’s censure, for publishing in the British Critic a favourable opinion of my work, and also for having been misled by me into a support of the most erroneous, and fanciful system of topography that could be devised ; I thought it my duty to state those facts clearly (if I could,) on which that system was founded. Mr. Bryant has also associated this gentleman with me as *my friend* ;

NOTE.

* See the whole argument advanced by Mr. Bryant—Some Observations, p. 51.

this is an honour to which I had no title, not being in the least degree acquainted with him, except by name; and that advantage I possess in common with, I believe, every literary man in England. Among the censures Mr. Bryant inflicts upon me, I acknowledge this flattering compliment, which overbalances them; although I am not sorry the learned critic is not *really* leagued with me; as I would rather owe his good opinion to his justice, than to his partiality, however highly I should esteem myself honoured by it.

If I have succeeded in answering these topographical arguments, the question stands as it did *before Mr. Bryant wrote. Homer's story is certainly adapted to Phrygia, and this is already a presumption in favour of its historical truth. To prove that it was false has been attempted, but I think cannot be accomplished; I do not see any arguments brought forward but what have been already refuted. † Mr. Bryant however not only attacks my arguments but my style, and almost every expression in the first two pages of my book. These I entirely abandon; my style is possibly very bad; and the reader's own taste will induce him to censure me, perhaps, much more than a critical judgment, though coming from Mr. Bryant's very highly respected authority. When he however charges me with ‡ *hatred, ill-will, malignity, contempt, &c.* I am more deeply concerned, and I can never acquiesce in his decision; I must

NOTES.

* I by no means feel inclined to acknowledge the force of any *other* arguments urged in his last two works. I cannot perceive any that are not a repetition of his first work, illustrated however, and put with much ingenuity. I think they have been sufficiently answered by the British Critic for January 1800; but even if Mr. Bryant should have established some *probabilities* against Troy, while much stronger remain opposed to him, we cannot accede to his opinion; and we have his own sanction for this. He tells us "a system founded on a variety of arguments, cannot be *in the least* affected, should one or two be arraigned as inconclusive." Can the united evidence of the ancient Historians be set aside on the score of one or two contradictory fables?

† Observations, 78.—‡ Expostulation, p. 6. Observations, *passim*.

therefore

therefore examine his proofs upon this subject. Now to read his account of me in his last two publications, the reader would conclude naturally that I was the most violent, malicious, unmannerly, petulant reptile, that ever put pen to paper. “ *Tantæne animis cælestibus iræ ?* But in truth I had no sort of intention, had it been in my power, (as it most certainly was not) to lessen Mr. Bryant’s literary character ; to which my ill-will and hatred must have been directed ; as *personally* I could not well hate a man I never saw. That character stands upon other grounds far different from any discussion about the existence of Troy ; nor did I ever know that Mr. Bryant chose to stake it upon the issue of this question. He had brought forward arguments, which *came from him with a weight, they seemed to me very little entitled to, from their intrinsic value ; and his very extensive reading, supplied him with a variety of quotations, which he interpreted in a manner, I thought, unwarranted by the ancient authors to whom he referred. I brought forward these passages, and I supposed that a partiality natural enough to his own hypothesis, had induced him to see in them much more than the reader could ; as for instance, †in the passage relative to Daphne of Thebes. It was Mr. Bryant’s object to prove that Homer probably composed his story from Egyptian materials ; to accomplish this he mentions Daphne, and refers to Diodorus, who says “ Homer borrowed many of his verses from her ;” by Thebes, Mr. Bryant says, was *originally* meant, Thebes in Egypt. To this I had objected, that in Diodorus the whole

NOTES.

* The personal respect due, and most highly due to the character of Mr. Bryant, had it been extended to an acquiescence in his arguments, might have led to some mistakes, which he himself will now acknowledge, when he recollects the opinions he entertained on the authenticity of Rowley ; his character was, I believe, very little injured by the refractory dissent of the author of the Archæological Epistle ; even a ludicrous reply to a bad argument, was not then considered as a personal invective.

† See Bryant on the war of Troy, and Vindication, p. 33.

passage

passage alludes to Thebes in Bœotia, and is therefore grossly perverted in order to support a system; * so thought also the British Critic. The charge we brought against him was certainly “the quoting Diodorus, and going directly contrary to what he expressly said;” and † Mr. Bryant says, that this is undoubtedly true, nay more, that he has acted in this manner a hundred or perhaps five hundred times. To quote an author we differ from when we try to confute him, is indeed usual enough; but certainly the case is different, when we quote him as *an authority*, and still worse when he is the *only* authority, as Diodorus is in this case. But Mr. Bryant says, and proves with much learning, that the city Taphanes in Egypt was called ‡ Daphnes and Daphne by the Greeks. Afterwards “she was a supposed Sibyl,” little better than a gipsy, whose father (Tiresias) was turned into a woman, then back again into a man, and whose whole history is a fable; if so, how in the name of common sense can we draw inferences from the story of Diodorus? If Daphne never existed, how could Homer borrow her verses? If she did exist, where is the proof of her being an Egyptian? in short, why is she mentioned at all, if all that is told us is vague and contradictory?

In another § place it was requisite to shew that Homer’s authority, as an historian, was looked upon by Herodotus as of no value.

NOTES.

* British Critic Review for January 1799.

† Expostulation, p. 49. He instances the quotations he gives from the British Critic, and yet he says, he differs from him in every article. Is this a similar instance?

‡ I suppose it must be from want of comprehension that I cannot perceive the tendency of this argument; but what inference can possibly be drawn from this Greek version of an Egyptian name? It was *not* the name of a priestess, and Mr. Bryant owns that many places of this name occur in different parts of the world; and yet this is all he can bring forward to shew that “he had *some* reason for his opinion:” surely this is *very little* reason, either to agree with, or to dissent from Diodorus.

§ See Bryant on the war of Troy, p. 86. *et seq.*

A difference between them is stated, in which the historian supports the account given by the Egyptian priests against that of the Poet. He also mentions the Cyprian verses, and then Mr. Bryant said, he dismisses them with the utmost contempt! "Away with them together, a long farewell to each; both to Homer, and the Cyprian Verses." * I guarded the reader here against Mr. Bryant's translation, and gave the original; but, says † Mr. Bryant, *χαιρε* is sometimes used as a term of contempt, and that in many instances. As for example, *Ελπις καὶ σὺ τυχὴ μεγάλα χαιρετε, &c. Spes et fortuna valet.* A long farewell to Hope and Fortune; this does not seem very contemptuous; but supposing ‡ *χαιρε* is sometimes used as an expression of contempt, what can any one think of Mr. Bryant's translation in this place? where Herodotus has for some pages endeavoured to assert the *truth* of Homer's story. For he shews in how many points it agreed with the history of Thone, and Proteus, with which he was acquainted through the Egyptian priests. The point Mr. Bryant should have attended to, perhaps was the coincidence of these accounts; the Egyptians were acquainted with the occasion of the war, they supposed Helen the wife of Menelaus, and Paris a prince of Phrygia; the annals of the Persian Empire also corresponded with those of Greece. According to the Egyptian

NOTES.

* Vindication, p. 67. See Herodotus, L. 2. c. 118. p. 157.

† Observations 38.

Ελπις καὶ σὺ τυχὴ μεγάλα χαιρετε, τὸν λιμὲν εὐροῖ;
Οὐδὲν ἐμοὶ χ' ὑμῖν παίζετε τῆς μετ' ἐμοῦ.

Away with ye *fond* Hope and Fortune; I have gained a safe Harbour; I have nothing more to do with you: Sport with others for the future who may come after me. Bryant.

‡ I cannot suppose it myself; it is true that Stephanus remarks, "*et iis χαιρεν dicimus quos in malam rem abire jubemus;*" So good b'w'ye, or farewell, may be used *ironically*; but this *Irony* would hardly find a place in the pages of an historian; and *χαιρεν*, like *farewell*, cannot be used in a *literal* bad sense.

story,

story, Helen never was suffered to leave Egypt; this shows that Homer was not the inventor of the story which they told, and surely their agreeing in every other point with the poet, if his account was entirely fabulous, is more extraordinary than their differing in one point of a real history, which is not at all uncommon. Mr. Bryant accuses me of neglecting this part of the argument, and drawing off the reader's attention, by cavilling at a loose translation of *χαίρει*, the meaning of which was rightly expressed, as he still thinks. The question however is not altogether indifferent; I think that if Herodotus despised Homer, his authority ought very much to influence our judgment; but since scarce any man has shewn a greater veneration than he did for the Poet, a proof of contempt must be better founded than on a dubious meaning of the word *χαίρει*. It is not sufficient even to prove that it may sometimes be used in a bad sense; there is positive proof it cannot be so understood here, for let any one examine the context and decide. If Mr. Bryant therefore brings the opinion of Herodotus forward to influence that of others, he must allow me to bring forward the whole of the passage alluded to, and he must excuse me if I take some notice of the very singular translation he gave. He also says it is of *trifling* moment; why then give it at all? certainly I was not the first person who *trifled* about the meaning of this word, but I could not pass it unnoticed, as it appeared to me a very strong proof, that anxiety for the support of his system, had induced Mr. Bryant to see that contempt of Homer in Herodotus, which Herodotus never expressed and never felt.

These and similar passages certainly decided my opinion that Mr. Bryant's mind was not so neutral as he himself perhaps imagined in this affair. By showing this I lessened the weight of his authority, which in all cases where he is really impartial, has and must have great influence on every reader. This appeal then from his Judgment was of use to my argument; where truth is the object

of investigation, it is safer to depend on the unbiaſſed judgment of the world, than on the prejudiced opinions of any man, however acute his penetration, or however extenſive his erudition. But this charge of prejudice muſt be proved in order to authoriſe the appeal. It reſts partly upon the facts I have mentioned; if theſe things are true, could I aſſign a motive more excuſable than Prejudice for Mr. Bryant's conduct? or was it uncandid in me to ſuppoſe that he was himſelf miſled, where attempts were made that ſeemed evidently calculated to miſlead others? But if the charge was really ſo unpardonable, why has Mr. Bryant given me an opportunity of renewing it? Why has he aſſerted that *I tax him with ignorance? that in my book, all that he has ſaid is treated as conjecture? that, †I tell the world his knowledge on the ſubject in which he is engaged, is on a par with the moſt ignorant? when on turning to ‡the paſſage alluded to in the Vindication, there is not one word to this purpoſe. So far from his ignorance I mention his erudition, and the whole ſentence is relative only to the very dubious information we poſſeſs of the life, and country of Homer. This is then a *miſrepresentation* throughout, of the very book he was attacking.

§ There is another paſſage from my book, of which, I believe, and hope, the negligence of Mr. Bryant's Printer has cauſed the miſquotation. Agamemnon was a title, it is ſaid, ſometimes given to Jupiter; Mr. Bryant hence concludes, that Homer borrowed the names of his heroes from provincial Deities; and that of courſe the hiſtory was all fabulous. Mr. Morritt ſaid, that “ ſuppoſing Agamemnon to have been one of the various names, or

NOTES.

* Obſervations, p. 72—95.—† Expoſtulation, p. 5.—‡ Vindication, p. 31.

§ Obſervations, p. 31. Vindication, p. 59.

epithets, under which Jupiter was honoured, it was just as probable that it should be given to men, by the custom of the times, as that Homer, in violation of every custom, should adopt a name, which could *not* be given to men." The meaning is, I trust, not very obscure; if Agamemnon was a name of Jupiter, and also a usual name of mortals, as Eurycreon, Eurymedon, &c. the hero of that name might exist, and Homer's story be true. If the name could not be given to men, in real life, but was confined to the God, the falsehood of the story is evident; but this is not proved, nor is it probable Homer would have adopted such a name. In transcribing this passage, the word *not* in the last line is changed into the word *only*, by *mistake*, I trust, and not by *design*; however, since Mr. Bryant here taxes me with confusion, and, in other words, with talking nonsense, I must observe that the confusion and nonsense is chiefly owing to this alteration, which certainly turns the whole argument into a mass of absurdity.

In answer to another argument of * Mr. Bryant's, founded on the size of the Grecian fortifications, I had observed, that they were probably not very durable, because, in the first place, they were finished in one day by the Grecian army; because the wall was pulled down, and a breach made in it by Sarpedon, and because Hector and Patroclus leaped over the ditch which defended it. In the seventh Book, after describing the Funerals of the Trojan warriors, Homer continues to † describe those of the Greeks, after the bodies were burnt the army retired to their ships. "Then before the day broke, while it was yet night, they raised a mound of earth over the bodies; and then they built the wall; "afterwards it is said," the sun went down, and the work of the Grecians was finished. They feast in the night, and then retire to rest." I agree with ‡

NOTES.

* Vindication, p. 57.—† Hom. Il. H. v. 433—475.—‡ Observations, p. 18.

Mr. Bryant, that there was more than *one* day allotted for the performance of all these duties, for the poet allots *two*; one for burning the dead, and one for raising the wall. Mr. Bryant says, the Poet speaks only of the parts of the civil day, in which the people were occupied. It does not appear so from Homer's expressions here; and his continuation, after the building of the wall, of what past in the night, appears as if he was giving a connected account of their conduct. It was thus understood by many ancient critics. For in a subsequent book it is said, that the Gods employed nine days in the destruction of the rampart: *Εννήμερον*. *Some of the ancient writers had objected, that the Gods were employed very long, considering the wall was only the work of *one day*, and built by human hands. Crates wished to solve the difficulty, but he did not solve it by supposing the Greeks to have been longer employed, but by lessening the efforts of the Gods, and proposing to read *Εν ημερα*, *one day*, instead of nine, in this place. Eustathius does not adopt this hypercriticism; but he also never seems to attack the principle of it, viz. that the wall was built in one day. Such were my inducements for supposing this to have been Homer's meaning, and I cannot therefore abandon my opinion, without fancying I understand him better than the ancient Greeks themselves.

The next observation I had made, is that Sarpedon pulled the Battlement down, and a breach was thereby made in the wall, a circumstance which implied no great height, and very little strength of masonry. He pulled down one of the battlements, which

NOTE.

* See Notes of Eustathius, Homer. II. M. l. 16. (*Junii, Basil. 1558.*)

defended the wall, * *ἢ δ' ἐσπετο πασα, τειχος εὐμνῶθη*, and that a breach practicable for the assailants was made, appears by the latter part of the line *πολλέσσι δὲ θῆκε κελευθόν*. A wall however of six or seven feet in height, with battlements of such a construction, need not be supposed to last for ages. The last assertion was, that “the ditch, rampart and palisades in the ditch were not very large, since they were within the compass of a desperate leap.” By the rampart I did not mean the wall, but the vallum or mound that defended the ditch in most ancient fortifications; that there was one however in this place, does not perhaps appear from Homer. He positively says that it was *not easy* to leap over it, and the horses stood neighing on the brink, † *Οὐτάρ' ὑπερβορεῖν σχεδόν*, which certainly does not imply impossibility. Afterwards I had said, Hector leaped over it, and Patroclus. In this passage I was extremely wrong, as Hector did not leap over it, and Mr. Bryant justly reprehends my assertion; I cannot however give up Patroclus, and the inference will still be equally strong. The words are to me as decisive as possible. ‡ *Ἀνίκρυ δ' ἀνα λαφρον ὑπερθορον ὠκεες ἵπποι*. Here Mr. Bryant says, they “bounded through the trench, quite through to the opposite side. For the verb *θορῶ* does not necessarily signify to leap over, but to prance or bound; certainly; but if *θορῶ* signifies to bound, *ὑπερθορῶ* signifies to bound over, or else what is the meaning of the preposition. The word *ἀνα* also implies ascent, and the passage is as strong as possible, “They leapt up over the ditch from side to side.” This Mr. Bryant says was not possible; for this however Homer is accountable; to be sure he qualifies it by saying, that the horses were immortal. But all this is not absolutely the strength of my argument. Mr. Bryant said that such a ditch was durable, and the credibility of Homer's narration depended on its appearance; I only brought these points forward to prove the work was probably

NOTES.

* M. 54.—† Hom. II. II. v. 380. See observations, p. 22.

not very durable ; but I had further observed, that many similar encampments had been destroyed, without impeaching the credibility of the authors who mentioned them ; that at all events the argument proved too much in this case, and to this point no answer has been attempted. As to the manner it was destroyed, an inundation caused by the Gods, operated in a very supernatural mode ; for all the rivers of Ida contributed. This article Mr. Bryant says is either believed or palliated by me. Believed it certainly never was ; and how do I palliate it ? by saying that even if this whole story was false, and the wall and rampart only introduced as an ornament to the Iliad, I see no reason for disbelieving the ground work of the poem ; but I do not think we have any reason to suppose there was no wall, or that it might not be destroyed by floods from Ida, and buried in the sands mentioned by Homer and Strabo as existing in this part of the plain. Homer exalts this fact, (if it is one) by the supernatural intervention of the Gods ; but a fable may have its original foundation in real history, and we know that poetical fiction is frequently so constructed. This is the real argument, and I hope Mr. Bryant will allow it to be more **conclusive* than most of mine are admitted to be.

A similar reply has been made to another part of my Vindication. † It had been said that Anaxagoras, the great and philosophic friend of Pericles, and Metrodorus of Lampfacus, disbelieved the whole of Homer's story ; and that Anaxagoras resided at Lampfacus ; and both therefore lived in the vicinity of Troy. Supposing this statement true, I had observed that Anaxagoras was born at least 687 years after the war of Troy, and that he is said to have been the first man who disbelieved it, that neither his work nor Metro-

NOTES.

* See Observations, p. 73.—† Vindication, p. 63. Observations, p. 35.

dorus's have been handed down to us. * Now many idle and doubtful stories are told of Anaxagoras by Diogenes Laertius, as Mr. Bryant himself allows, and yet he is the only author quoted for this story. That, according to him, Anaxagoras was possibly never resident at Lampfacus, but died at Athens; and that of † Metrodorus very little was known. That it was not probable their opinions, if well founded, should have no weight at the time they lived and wrote, and that their being ‡ “consigned to oblivion,” while Homer's story survived, was a strong presumption against their arguments. The profound philosophy and celebrated character of Anaxagoras is set up in opposition to these doubts; but if his arguments had so little weight with those to whom his profound philosophy and character were so much better known, why should they have more now, when all his writings are lost, and we only receive this opinion from § Phavorinus, quoted by Diogenes Laertius? But after all, did these philosophers disbelieve the story? I think it cannot be inferred from what Diogenes Laertius has told us. Anaxagoras *seems* to have been the first who shewed that Homer's poetry treated *περι ἀρεῆς καὶ δικαιοσύνης*, of virtue and justice; Metrodorus thought he discovered in it also an allegorical allusion

NOTES.

* Observations, p. 37. See Diogenes Laertius, L. 2. *seg.* 8. and *seg.*

† This friend of Anaxagoras was clearly not the celebrated Metrodorus of Lampfacus, for Diogenes afterwards tells us, that this last was the Scholar of Epicurus, and of course was much posterior to the age of Pericles. See Diog. Laert. 10. *seg.* 22.

‡ These words Mr. Bryant considers as unnecessarily contemptuous. It is however a plain matter of fact, as an author he is *consigned to oblivion*, for his works on this subject (if there were any) did not exist in the time of Diogenes, or he would not have quoted Phavorinus. As a man of great learning and Philosophy, *his name*, I own, has not been consigned to oblivion, but his opinions have. See Observations, p. 37.

§ The word used by Diogenes in mentioning the account from Phavorinus, is, that Anaxagoras *seems* to have been the first who thought Homer's story treated of virtue and justice, *δοξεί*. Can we adopt as proofs, arguments drawn from expressions so uncertain, and authors quoted through quotations of other authors?

to natural history. Suppose the one to have discovered the moral of Homer, and the other to have adapted his Gods and Goddesses to the natural philosophy of the times, by making Jupiter the Air, for instance, Neptune the Sea, &c. does it at all appear from hence that they disbelieved the war of Troy? In the first place then, it will be difficult to prove that they were of this opinion, and ten times more so to support them in it.

* But almost every other writer, and many of the earliest writers believed the war, and Mr. Bryant refers to p. 69 of my work; where, he says, “ I would maintain the certainty of the war, from its being universally credited, and credited by persons of the greatest learning and knowledge. † But these persons also believed in Centaurs, Satyrs, Nymphs, &c. In Augury and Aruspicy, Homer maintained that horses could speak, &c. &c. *cum multis aliis.*” What has religious belief to do with historical facts? is not the evidence on which our faith rests in matters of Religion totally different, in all its parts, from the testimony on which we ground our belief in history? In the religious belief of the ancients, the evidence only tended to prove the Inspiration of some oracle, or other gross imposture; but in matters of history, evidence of the fact was required. Surely Thucydides, after carefully considering the very objections Mr. Bryant makes, records the Trojan war as an historical fact, and certainly not as he would have recorded the war of the Titans. I had observed that these ancient authors had access to many writings, and were acquainted with many traditions now lost; and Mr. Bryant taking no notice at all of their au-

NOTES.

* Observations, p. 39.

† Guicciardini was a Roman Catholick, believed in miracles of Saints, transubstantiation, &c. as all Italy and a great part of Europe did at the time he wrote. Does any one on that account dispute the truth of his historical narrative?

thority, except as being credulous believers in fable, quotes Libanius, and then says, * that authors like him deserve more regard than I am willing to shew, because they had access to many histories now lost. What regard then is due to Thucydides, Herodotus, &c? But if the religion of the Greeks induced them to believe in this fable, what influence had that religion upon the priests of Memphis, and the historians of Persepolis? for the history of Troy was found by Herodotus in both these places, and in both with little variation from the Greek story. If then Mr. Bryant will shew that the † *Koran of Mahomet* is believed by nations who are not Mahometans, we will allow him to put the Iliad upon the same footing with it, but not till then.

Contrary also to every principle of criticism, Mr. Bryant in another place maintains that ‡ Euripides was equally to be relied on with Homer, or any other *foreigner*; he (Euripides) being of Hellas, and Homer being like him a Poet. But Homer's country was not known; he certainly by his language does not seem what Euripides would have called a *foreigner*, and he lived five or six hundred years earlier, a circumstance Mr. Bryant entirely passes over. Yet he says, that, while I reject Euripides, I refer to Tzetzes, (certainly not as authority to disprove the ancient writers;) and even to Freinshemius, Vindication, p. 117. If the reader will have the goodness to turn to this page, he will see that Mr. Chevalier had transcribed a long account from Freinshemius, and that I notice it expressly in this place only to carry it back to Arrian, of whose account it is a positive translation. I never mention Freinshemius or Tzetzes as au-

NOTES.

* This argument of Mr. Bryant certainly proves too much for his purpose. Why should we allow that authority to Libanius, which he denies to the earlier writers. Surely the reverse of this mode of reasoning would be more obvious to unbiassed minds. Observations, p. 46.

† Observations, p. 46.—‡ Observations, p. 28.

thority,

thority, and therefore this is an additional instance of misrepresentation, and in a book written by Mr. Bryant to vindicate himself from this very unpleasant charge. In the ninety-first page, Mr. Bryant himself brings forward Monsieur Paschal as an evidence against the Trojan war, so that if I had quoted Freinshemius, his modernism could not have been any objection.

I have thus gone through the most material arguments relative to the Topography of Troy. I have shewn, I trust, that it is consistent with Homer to a very great degree, and that Strabo as well as Pliny, tend greatly to confirm our statement ; but that all three are decidedly incompatible with Mr. Bryant's map and his conjecture relative to Ophrynum. I have thought it necessary also to reply to some of the charges advanced against me in Mr. Bryant's Observations ; especially since he has repeated many of them in his last work. I never thought when I wrote my first Answer, that it would be arraigned as abusive, or that Mr. Bryant considered his personal credit impeached by an attack on his arguments. Since however, " unfounded censures cannot but affect the character of the censurer," I have been obliged to shew that mine are not totally unfounded, and that some misquotations and misrepresentations of cited passages really do appear in Mr. Bryant's first works, and are repeated in his defence of them. I infer from hence that he is not neutral on this subject, that he sees all passages in a point of view more favourable for his argument, than others will. I therefore caution the readers of his work, from trusting to his quotations : at the same time, I believe, he himself, (so far from being guilty of intentional fraud,) has the greatest reliance upon the proofs he gives. Prejudices of a similar nature, may for ought I know bias me. I claim no neutrality ; but I rest the controversy upon the arguments I have brought forward ; Mr. Bryant says they are inconclusive ; with great submission, I think differently, but others must decide the question. I have as high a veneration as any one

for the erudition, and literary character of Mr. Bryant, but the best and greatest men have sometimes adopted very singular opinions, which no extent of literature or acuteness of reasoning could defend. I am very glad to find that in his last two works the Egyptian part of the hypothesis is abandoned for the present, as it certainly tends to simplify the question between us. I shall therefore conclude, with Mr. Bryant's favourite passage, which I can assure him, I shall always understand without any mixture of contempt:

Ωμηρος μὲν νῦν καὶ τὰ ΒΡΥΑΝΤΙΑ ἐπεὶ χαιρετεῖ.

THE END.

Special 90-B
15413

Special

90-B 15413

Bound w/

90-B 15417

90-B 15419

90-B 15421

90-B 15424

90-B 15422

90-B 15425

